UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,190	12/15/2003	Marko K. Mahkonen	944-3.161-1	5556

4955 7590 08/09/2006

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
MILORD, MARCEAU	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/737,190	MAHKONEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marceau Milord	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang et al (US Patent No 7010317 B2) in view of Mikola et al (US Patent No 6862450 B2).

a. Regarding claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, Hwang et al discloses a method for enabling an attribute (figs. 17-18) used in respect to communication between a NodeB (1705, 1735 of fig. 17; 701, 703 of fig. 7) and a user equipment device (1711 of fig. 17; 711 of fig. 7), the NodeB operative according to control by a radio network controller (1702, 1733 of fig. 17or 1802, 1804 of fig. 18) of a radio access network using System Information Blocks communicated between elements of the RAN and communicated to the UE device in radio contact with the RAN as a way of configuring communication channels provided by the RAN (col. 5, line 45- col. 6, line 4; col. 13, lines 3-24; col. 15,lines 18-31; col. 31, lines 30-56), the method characterized by: a step in which the NodeB configures itself for

communication with the UE device according to a trigger field consisting of at least one bit included in at least one of the SIBs, wherein the at least one bit corresponds to the attribute (col. 15, line 42- col. 16, line 41;col. 23, lines 3-57;col. 33, lines 3-40; col. 34, lines 2-62; col. 16, lines 43-61; col. 17, line 16- col 18, line 21;col. 34, lines 2-62).

However, Hwang et al does not specifically disclose the features of disabling an attribute; wherein the trigger field is used to prompt a response from the UE device, and the method is further characterized by a step in which the NodeB completes a procedure upon receipt of the response from the UE device.

Mikola et al, on the other hand, discloses a mobile telecommunications system with radio network controllers capable of exchanging control of a communication link to a user equipment that comprises a means for preparing at the target radio network controller for the relocation, a means for providing a reset signal from the source radio network controller to the user equipment, means responsive to the reset signal for resetting state variables of the user equipment, and means for relocating the control of the communication link from the source radio network controller to the target radio network controller. The means for preparing may include means for initializing or resetting one or more state variables of the target radio network controller. The state variables of the target radio network controller may, for instance, include a receive state variable, a highest expected state variable and a maximum acceptable receive state variable. The state variable of the user equipment may, for instance, include a send state variable, an acknowledge state variable or a maximum send state variable (col. 3, line 51- col. 4, line 58). In addition, the Radio Link Control layer triggers the RLC reset in order to recover from an error situation and to resynchronize the peer RLC entities. This is done by resetting the state variables

to their initial value and resetting the configurable parameters to their configured value on both peer RLC entities. After a successful RLC reset, the RLC entity can continue the interrupted data transmission (col. 2, line 63- col. 3, line 7; col. 6, line 55- col. 7, line 15; col. 7, line 49- col. 8, line 37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the technique of Mikola to the communication system of Hwang in order to trigger attributes used in communication between the Radio Access Network and a User Equipment and reset the configurable parameters to their configured value on both peer RLC entities.

Regarding claims 2, 11, 13, Hwang et al as modified discloses a method for enabling an attribute (figs. 17-18) used in respect to communication between a NodeB (1705, 1735 of fig. 17; 701, 703 of fig. 7) and a user equipment device (1711 of fig. 17; 711 of fig. 7), wherein the RNC communicates to the NodeB information sufficient to indicate the trigger field (col. 15, line 42- col. 16, line 41;col. 23, lines 3-57;col. 33, lines 3-40).

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore is rejected under a similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 3, and therefore is rejected under a similar rationale.

Regarding claim 6, Hwang et al as modified discloses a method for enabling an attribute (figs. 17-18) used in respect to communication between a NodeB (1705, 1735 of fig. 17; 701, 703 of fig. 7) and a user equipment device (1711 of fig. 17; 711 of fig. 7), further characterized in that the trigger field consists of a plurality of bits each of which corresponds to a predetermined attribute governing communication between the UE device and the NodeB, and one of each of the two possible bit values of the respective bits is predetermined to indicate

enabling the corresponding attribute (col. 16, lines 43-61; col. 17, line 16- col 18, line 21;col. 34, lines 2-62).

Regarding claim 7, Hwang et al as modified discloses a method for enabling an attribute (figs. 17-18) used in respect to communication between a NodeB (1705, 1735 of fig. 17; 701, 703 of fig. 7) and a user equipment device (1711 of fig. 17; 711 of fig. 7), further characterized in that a plurality of SIBs are each used to convey a respective trigger field and each such trigger field consists of at least one bit predetermined to correspond to a respective attribute governing communication between the UE device and the NodeB (col. 15, line 42- col. 16, line 41;col. 23, lines 3-57;col. 33, lines 3-40; col. 34, lines 2-62; col. 16, lines 43-61; col. 17, line 16- col 18, line 21;col. 34, lines 2-62).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kim et al discloses a method for controlling power of TFCI for DSCK IN 3G standard mobile communication system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marceau Milord whose telephone number is 571-272-7853. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MARCEAU MILORD

M Milord
MARCEAU MILORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

8-1-06

Marceau Milord
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2618